

APPENDIX B - COMPARISON OF AMENDED LAND USE PLANS WITHIN THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, IDAHO FALLS AND TWIN FALLS DISTRICTS, BY ALTERNATIVE

The following tables compare and contrast potential land use planning direction and action changes for each land use plan (LUP) in the planning area. The potential changes would occur based on which alternative is picked in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Fire, Fuels, and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This information is organized in columnar format to allow easy comparison among alternatives. The No Action Alternative represents current management direction, and Alternative E represents the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM's) Proposed Plan Amendment. The alternative descriptions that follow have been reformatted and abbreviated to facilitate comparison of the alternatives as they would affect each LUP. See Chapter 2 of the EIS for the complete descriptions of alternatives.

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Management Direction Common To All Alternatives	<p>Management Restrictions:</p> <p>Wildland fire suppression restrictions and restoration/fuels reduction treatment restrictions would be implemented under all alternatives and would be specified in each of the 12 LUP amendments. These restrictions would be applied to suppression activities and vegetation treatment actions with the intent of protecting sensitive resources. This section lists the resource disciplines for which restrictions were developed. Appendix Q describes in detail the management actions to be applied.</p> <p>Wildland Fire Suppression Restrictions:</p> <p>Suppression restrictions were developed for the following resource disciplines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire Management • Cultural Resources and Historic Trails • Noxious Weeds • Recreation • Riparian Areas • Special Designations (wilderness study areas [WSAs], Areas of Critical Environmental Concern ACECs) • Vegetation <p>Fire and Non-Fire Vegetation Treatment Restrictions:</p> <p>The following fire and non-fire vegetation treatment restrictions will be applied to site-specific restoration and hazardous fuels reduction treatment actions for the following resource disciplines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation • Air Quality • Cultural Resources and Historic Trails • Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites • Livestock Grazing • Placeholder Species • Riparian Areas • Special Management Areas • Visual Resources • Wildlife 				

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Management Direction Common To All Action Alternatives		<p>Desired Future Condition (DFC): DFC is considered a management objective. For the purposes of this analysis, it indicates the proportional distribution of vegetation age classes/successional stages across the landscape. Each vegetation age class represents different vegetation species composition. Attaining a DFC within a vegetation type will promote a healthier and more diverse vegetation structure and composition, and return the currently altered fire regime to a fire regime that more closely parallels the historical fire regime. See Chapter 2 for DFC by vegetation type.</p> <p>Prioritization Criteria: The following would be the top two priorities under all action alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fire-fighter and public safety are the first priorities in response to fire suppression. At no time will the activities described in this EIS compromise fire-fighter and public safety. 2. Protection of property and Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). <p>WUI areas were identified in the National Fire Plan as areas requiring protection and are common to all alternatives. Communities-at-risk were identified and WUI areas are designated through County/City Mitigation plans initiated by local fire chiefs and through statewide interagency planning efforts. WUI areas exist around communities-at-risk (as defined in Federal Register Notice, Volume 66, August 17, 2001). The National Fire Plan mandates that priority be given to protecting these communities from wildland fire and to preventing fires started on private lands from spreading to public lands. In all alternatives developed including the No Action, WUI areas would take precedence if suppression resources are limited and life and property are threatened. Vegetation treatments in and around the WUI will be designed to mitigate fire hazard. Site-specific National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) documentation would be required for all federally funded projects, regardless of ownership.</p> <p>Vegetation treatment priorities would vary by field office as vegetation types vary across the planning area. In general, vegetation treatment priorities include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversify Perennial Grass to speed reestablishment of sagebrush cover • Enhance structural and species diversity in degraded Low-elevation sagebrush steppe • Reduce shrub and Juniper density in Mid-elevation Shrub • Reduce invasive or noxious weeds in all vegetation types 			

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rejuvenate Aspen stands, reduce insect infestation and disease, and create a diversity of forest successional stages across the landscape • In Mountain Shrub, rejuvenate old, decadent shrubs and increase cover and density of desirable herbaceous species • Restore historical successional processes in vegetated rock/lava <p>Management Restrictions: Appendix Q lists additional restrictions that are common to all action alternatives.</p>			
Fire Management Goals And Objectives	1) Emphasize protection from and rehabilitation after wildland fire within the WUI.	1) Make progress toward DFC in Low-elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Invasive Annual Grass vegetation types where wildland fire should occur less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape than it currently does.	1) Make progress toward DFC in Low-elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, and Invasive Annual Grass vegetation types so that wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape than it currently does. Reduce by half the number of wildland fires in these vegetation types to create a wildland fire regime within the historical range of variability.	1) Make progress toward DFC in the Low-elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, Invasive Annual Grass, Mid-elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Juniper plant vegetation types.	1) Make progress toward DFC in the Low-elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass, Invasive Annual Grass, Mid-elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Juniper vegetation types.

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
	<p>2) Reduce fine fuels and undesirable non-native plants to create perennial cover types so that wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape than it currently does.</p> <p>3) Conduct fire and non-fire vegetation treatments in Mid-elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub.</p>	<p>2) Make progress toward DFC in the Mid-elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types where wildland fire should occur more frequently on the landscape than it currently does.</p> <p>3) Maintain or make progress toward DFC in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Salt Desert Shrub cover types, and in vegetation types where fire frequencies are within the historical range of variability.</p>	<p>2) Make progress toward DFC in the Mid-elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types by increasing the use of wildland fire and RxFire to create a fire regime within the historical range of variability.</p> <p>3) In Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, Salt Desert Shrub, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types and/or areas in Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1, maintain vegetation conditions using mechanical, chemical, prescribed fire, or wildland fire use (WFU) treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are within the historical range of variability (i.e., maintain the current fire regimes in these</p>	<p>2) Maintain, protect, and expand sage grouse Source Habitats.</p> <p>3) Treat sage grouse Key and Restoration Habitats to expand Source Habitats. Improve and maintain sage grouse Restoration (R1-3) and Key Habitats.</p>	<p>2) Maintain, protect, and expand sage grouse Source Habitats.</p> <p>3) Treat sage grouse Key and Restoration Habitats to expand Source Habitats. Improve and maintain sage grouse Restoration (R1-3) and Key Habitats.</p>

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
			vegetation types).		
					<p>4) Make progress toward DFC in historically frequent fire regimes (Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, Mid-elevation Shrub encroached by Juniper, Mountain Shrub) by increasing WFU and RxFire to create a fire regime within the historical range of variability.</p> <p>5) In the Wet/Cold Conifer vegetation type and/or areas in FRCC 1, maintain vegetation conditions using mechanical, chemical, RxFire, or WFU treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are within the historical range of variability (i.e., maintain the current fire regime in these vegetation types).</p>

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Prioritization Criteria	<p>When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, suppression priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of human life is the single, overriding priority. • Protection of human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements will follow in importance. • Protection of cultural and natural resources will be based on the values to be protected, human health and safety, and costs of protection. Once people are assigned, these human resources become highest value to be protected. <p>Other priorities from</p>	<p>When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities will follow the two prioritization criteria described under Common to All Action Alternatives, followed by the following prioritization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize risks to sagebrush steppe. • Minimize risks to Dry Conifer. • Criteria for establishing vegetation treatments are: • Sagebrush steppe protection/maintenance. Prioritize treatment to areas that are adjacent to existing sagebrush cover types. • Sagebrush 	<p>When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities will follow the two prioritization criteria under Common to All Action Alternatives, followed by the following prioritization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize risks to Low-elevation Shrub vegetation type where frequent, uncharacteristic fires occur. • Minimize risks to other vegetation types, where changes in fuel accumulation and fire occurrence have occurred (i.e., FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 areas). <p>Criteria for establishing vegetation treatments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape-scale 	<p>When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities will follow the two prioritization criteria described under Common to All Action Alternatives, followed by the following prioritization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize risks to sage grouse Source Habitats. • Minimize risks to sage grouse Key Habitats. • Minimize risks to sage grouse Restoration Habitats. <p>Criteria for establishing vegetation treatments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within sage grouse Source Habitat, treat areas of low resilience. • Within Key and 	<p>When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities will follow the two prioritization criteria described under Common to All Action Alternatives, followed by the following prioritization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize risks to sage grouse Source, Key and Restoration Habitats. • Minimize risks to habitats occupied by threatened, endangered, and candidate species. • Minimize risks to resources where changes in fuel accumulation and fire occurrence have occurred (i.e., FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 areas). <p>Criteria for establishing</p>

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
	<p>BLM wildland fire policy and the existing LUPs, will be reflected in all Wildland Fire Situation Analyses (WFSAs).</p> <p>Priorities for establishing fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use RxFire and non-fire fuels treatments to improve/enhance FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 acres where public/firefighter safety or WUI are at risk. • Use RxFire and non-fire fuels treatments to maintain FRCC 1 acres where hazardous fuels pose a risk to public or firefighter safety. • Use prescribed fire and non-fire fuels treatments to 	<p>steppe restoration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aspen/Conifer, Mountain Shrub, Dry Conifer restoration. • Protection of areas of key ecosystem components that are at high risk of loss. 	<p>projects designed to reduce the combined risk to human life/property and resources (e.g., where WUIs and ecosystems at risk coincide).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects designed through interagency planning performed at the landscape level in conjunction with active community participation and development of stakeholder partnerships in the planning and monitoring processes. 	<p>Restoration Habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat areas adjacent to Source Habitat. • Enhance Key Habitat. • Treat areas that pose a fire risk to Source and Key Habitats. • Treat areas adjacent to Key Habitat. 	<p>vegetation treatments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape-scale projects designed to reduce the combined risk to human life/property and resources (e.g., where WUIs and ecosystems at risk coincide). • Sagebrush Steppe (Low-elevation Shrub, Mid-elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub). In designing vegetation treatments potentially affecting greater sage-grouse, consider the incorporation of selected conservation measures as identified in Appendix R. • In the WUI, where practical and

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
	<p>improve or enhance FRCC 2 or FRCC 3 acres where sage-grouse habitat is at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use RxFire and on-fire fuels treatments to improve or enhance FRCC 2 or FRCC 3 acres where wildlife areas of concern are at risk. • Use RxFire and non-fire fuels treatments to improve or enhance FRCC 2 or FRCC 3 acres where other resources are at risk. 				<p>appropriate, projects will be designed through interagency planning performed at the landscape level, in conjunction with active community participation and development of stakeholder partnerships in the planning and monitoring processes.</p>
Acres Suitable for WFU ^{1/}	0 acres	427,500 acres	135,500 acres	800 acres	135,000 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	552,000 acres	124,500 acres	416,600 acres	551,300 acres	417,000 acres

TABLE 1. BENNETT HILLS – TIMMERMAN HILLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade ^{2/}	25,600 acres				

¹ All acre figures are rounded to the nearest 100 acres and are subject to rounding error.

² These footprint acres are estimated by multiplying the percent of the planning area occupied by the individual LUPs times the total footprint acres proposed for treatment in the No Action Alternative.

TABLE 2. BIG DESERT MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	111,900 acres	128,900 acres	1,000 acres	128,900 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	652,500 acres	540,600 acres	523,600 acres	651,500 acres	523,600 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	41,100 acres				

Note: Lands managed by the BLM within Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve are not included in the WFU acres presented above.

TABLE 3. BIG LOST MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	155,100 acres	65,800 acres	5,200 acres	65,800 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	155,200 acres	100 acres	89,400 acres	150,000 acres	89,400 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	7,200 acres				

TABLE 4. CASSIA RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	297,300 acres	260,100 acres	146,500 acres	260,100 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	471,100 acres	173,800 acres	211,000 acres	324,600 acres	211,000 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	21,800 acres				

TABLE 5. LITTLE LOST BIRCH CREEK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	332,500 acres	38,400 acres	3,800 acres	38,400 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	332,900 acres	400 acres	294,500 acres	329,100 acres	294,500 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	15,400 acres				

TABLE 6. MAGIC MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	24,600 acres	13,800 acres	0 acres	13,800 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	24,600 acres	0 acres	10,800 acres	24,600 acres	10,800 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	1,100 acres				

TABLE 7. MALAD MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	194,400 acres	249,700 acres	127,600 acres	249,700 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	359,500 acres	165,100 acres	109,800 acres	231,900 acres	109,800 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	16,700 acres				

TABLE 8. MEDICINE LODGE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	458,800 acres	269,100 acres	7,700 acres	269,100 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	650,900 acres	192,100 acres	381,800 acres	643,200 acres	381,800 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	30,100 acres				

TABLE 9. MONUMENT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	569,800 acres	27,500 acres	0 acres	27,500 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	781,600 acres	211,800 acres	754,100 acres	781,600 acres	754,100 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	56,700 acres				

Note: Lands managed by the BLM within Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve are not included in the WFU acres presented above.

TABLE 10. POCATELLO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	76,900 acres	222,700 acres	86,100 acres	222,700 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	260,400 acres	183,500 acres	37,700 acres	174,300 acres	37,700 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	12,100 acres				

TABLE 11. SUN VALLEY MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	183,500 acres	216,600 acres	10,400 acres	216,600 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	248,700 acres	65,200 acres	32,100 acres	238,300 acres	32,100 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	11,500 acres				

TABLE 12. TWIN FALLS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN					
Management Direction	Alternative A - No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E (Proposed Plan Amendment)
Restrictions on fire management practices if needed to protect resources	See Fire Management Restrictions Common to All Alternatives and Common to All Action Alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Fire management goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria	See the goals, objectives, and prioritization criteria for all five alternatives as presented in the preceding Bennett Hills – Timmerman Hills Amendment table.				
Acres Suitable for WFU	0 acres	82,500 acres	121,400 acres	40,800 acres	121,400 acres
Acres Not Suitable for WFU	234,100 acres	151,600 acres	112,700 acres	193,300 acres	112,700 acres
Anticipated type and level of fire activity and fuel treatment		Approximately 2.5 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 7 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment	Approximately 6.2 times the No Action Alternative level of treatment
Estimated footprint acres treated per decade	10,800 acres				

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK